

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review Applicant's present application. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed August 15, 2003. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Objections to the drawings

The drawings stand objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5). Specifically, the Examiner states that Figure 4 includes reference number 24, which is not mentioned in the specification. A Replacement Sheet of drawings is submitted herewith, as well as an Annotated Sheet Showing Changes. The revised Figure 4, as shown in these sheets, removes reference number 24 and the arrow extending from this reference number. Additionally, it appears that the original Figure 4 included two instances of reference number 26. One of these instances has been removed from the revised figure. The Examiner's objection is therefore believed to have been overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Objections to the specification

The Examiner objects to the specification because of a number of informalities. Applicant has amended the specification to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner on pages 5-13. Applicant has also amended the specification to correct a misspelling ("alterately" has been corrected to "alternately") in paragraph [0011]. As to the Examiner's objection to [c1], [c2, ... on pages 16 through 20, Applicant notes that the application was filed electronically using the USPTO Electronic Filing System (EFS) and that these notations were generated by EFS. Nevertheless, the claims are set forth above without these notations. The Examiner's objections to the specification are therefore believed to have been overcome, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2-3, 10-11, 16-18, 21, 25, 27, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

As to claims 2 and 3, the Examiner notes that the term "the differential capacitance monometer" was not previously recited and that the claims are therefore indefinite. Applicant has amended claims 2 and 3 to recite a "CDS" instead of a "differential capacitance monometer". A CDS (capacitance diaphragm sensor) is recited in claim 1, thereby providing antecedent basis for the use of this term in claims 2 and 3. It is therefore believed that the amended claims are not indefinite. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

As to claim 10, the Examiner states that it is not clear what "the center-tap" represents. The Examiner asks whether "the center-tap" is different from or the same as "center-tap primary winding". Applicant has amended claim 10 to replace "the center-tap" with "a center-tap of the center-tapped primary winding". This language is believed to clearly indicate that the center-tap is distinct from, but a part of the center-tapped primary winding. It is therefore believed that claim 10, as amended, is not indefinite. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

As to claim 11, the Examiner states that it is not clear whether "the primary windings" refers to "the one or more primary windings" or "a pair of primary windings". Applicant has amended claim 11 to recite "the pair of primary windings". Claim 11, as amended, is therefore not believed to be indefinite. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

As to claim 16, the Examiner states that "the charge amplifier" was not previously recited. Applicant has amended claim 16 to delete the word "charge" before "amplifier". The term "amplifier" has antecedent basis in claim 8. Applicant also amended claim 16 to insert "a" before "guard voltage source". Claim 16, as amended, is therefore also believed not to be indefinite. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

As to claim 17 the Examiner states that it is not clear whether "and excitation voltage source" is different from or the same as "a voltage source" which was previously recited. Applicant has amended claim 17 to recite the limitation "wherein the guard voltage source comprises the first voltage source". The Examiner's rejection is therefore believed to be moot. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

As to claim 18, the Examiner states that the limitation "the excitation voltage source" has not been recited previously. Applicant has amended claim 18 to depend from claim 17, which includes this term and therefore provides antecedent basis for use of the term in claim 18.

Claim 18, as amended, is therefore believed not to be indefinite. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

As to claim 21, the Examiner states that the limitation "the charge amplifier" has not been recited previously. Applicant has amended claim 21 to depend from claim 9, which includes this term and therefore provides antecedent basis for use of the term in claim 21. Claim 21, as amended, is therefore believed not to be indefinite. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

As to claims 25 and 29, the Examiner states that it is not clear whether "the signal" refers to "the signal induced on the secondary winding of the current transformer" or "an amplified signal corresponding to the signal induced on the secondary winding of the current transformer". Applicant has amended claims 25 and 29 to add to the word "amplified" before "signal" in order to clarify that the recited signal is the "amplified signal corresponding to the signal induced on the secondary winding of the current transformer". Applicant therefore believes that claims 25 and 29, as amended, are not indefinite. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

As to claim 27, the Examiner states that the limitation "the excitation source" has not been previously recited. Applicant has amended claim 27 to change "the excitation source" to "a source of the excitation voltage". "The excitation voltage" finds antecedent basis in claim 26. Applicant therefore believes that claim 27, as amended, is not indefinite. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

As to claim 30, the Examiner states that the claim is rejected because it depends upon claim 29. As noted above, applicant believes that claim 29 is not indefinite. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Allowable subject matter

The Examiner allows claims 1, 4-7, 8-9, 12-15, 19, 20, 22-24, 26, 28 and 31-33. The Examiner also notes that claims 2-3, 10-11, 16-18, 21, 25, 27, 29 and 30 would be allowed if amended to overcome the corresponding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the Examiner's rejections and objections to the pending claims have been overcome and that all pending claims are allowable.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and objections and allow all claims.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include an acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-0456 of Gray Cary Ware & Freidenrich, LLP.

Respectfully submitted,

Gray Cary Ware & Freidenrich LLP
Attorneys for Applicant



Mark L. Berrier
Reg. No. 35,066

Dated: 10/31/03

1221 South MoPac Expressway, Suite 400
Austin, TX 78746-6875
Tel. (512) 457-7016
Fax. (512) 457-7001